



**Executive Committee Meeting
November 16, 2001
Draft - Meeting Summary**

The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.

Executive Committee members present:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Kargianis
Chair | <input type="checkbox"/> Rob McKenna
Vice-Chair, King County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Mathis
FHWA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sants Contreras (Alt.)
City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sen. Horn
WA State Senate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sen. Margarita Prentice
WA State Senate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie Marshall
City of Bellevue | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Edwards
PSRC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Randy Corman
City of Renton |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Okamoto
WSDOT | <input type="checkbox"/> Rosemarie Ives
City of Redmond | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Mullet
City of Tukwila |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dick Paylor
City of Bothell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan McBride
City of Kirkland | <input type="checkbox"/> Grant Degginger (Alt.)
City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonny Putter
City of Newcastle | <input type="checkbox"/> Pam Carter (Alt.)
City of Tukwila | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aubrey Davis (Alt.)
WSTC |
| <input type="checkbox"/> David Dye (Alt.)
WSDOT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Cothorn
Snohomish County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dave Somers
Snohomish County |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cheryl Pflug
WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Christopher Hurst
WA State House of Reps. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Paine (Alt.)
City of Redmond |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Julia Patterson (Alt.)
WA State Senate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harold Taniguchi
WSDOT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tim Olsen
City of Bothell |

Staff and Observers

Johannes Kurz, Snohomish County
Phil Fordyce, WSDOT
David Russell, Citizen
Kevin Shively, Transportation Choices
Peter Hurley, Citizen Committee
David Hunter, Citizen
Janet Ray, AAA
Jeff Switzer, ESJ
Peter Beaulieu, Steering Committee
John Healy, Transportation Choices

Jim Hutchinson, Bellevue Chamber of
Commerce

Paul Carr, Steering Committee
Greg Zimmerman, Steering Committee
Bruce Nurse, Kemper Development Co.
Emilio Cantu, Citizen Committee
Virginia Gunby, Citizen
Terra Hegy, Steering Committee
Anirudh Sahni, Citizen
Eddie Low, Steering Committee
Therese Swanson, Steering Committee
Kemper Freeman, Kemper Development
Co.
Brad Larssen, Pacific NW Regional
Council of Carpenters

Project Management Team

Mike Cummings, WSDOT
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental
Ron Anderson, DEA
Phil Fordyce, WSDOT
Rita Brogan, PRR

Paul Bergman, PRR
Brian O'Sullivan, Sound Transit
Ann Martin, King County
Melanie Moores, WSDOT
Christina Martinez, WSDOT

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kargianis called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. He noted that the program's decision-making process started in July 1999 and has included a great deal of public involvement. He said there have been approximately 13 Citizen Committee meetings, 20 Steering Committee meetings and 20 Executive Committee meetings. He also noted that the program has held nine public hearings/meetings and received a tremendous amount of input over the past two years. The I-405 Corridor Program is one of the most publicized public undertakings in years. Chairman Kargianis acknowledged everyone's hard work and thanked the committees for their dedication.

Mr. Kargianis reviewed the agenda for the day:

- Feedback on Preferred Alternative.
- Review/Approve Areas of Consensus.
- Review/Discuss Remaining Issues.
- Make Recommendations.
- Celebrate!

Chairman Kargianis invited public comment. He said due to time constraints, comments would be limited to 3 minutes. He said that written comments are also welcome.

Kemper Freeman, a Citizen Committee member, was the first to give public comment. He said the corridor is the economic engine, key employment center, and major growth area of Washington State. He noted that three of the largest gathering places for people - SeaTac, Southcenter Mall, and Bellevue Square - are along the corridor. He said the corridor's importance reaches beyond the workplace.

Mr. Freeman said he's strongly in favor of Alternative 3. However, he urged the committee to complete program improvements within 5 years, if possible. He said this would increase the number of years we will enjoy the benefits from the improvements. He said tolerance for construction delays is zero. He suggested zero impact construction. He said they have all worked hard on the program, and as a group should suggest studies for I-605 and I-5 as well. He said if these parallel corridors are not looked at, the I-405 program's hard work would be forsaken.

The second public commenter, Anirudh Sahni, a Microsoft software engineer, said he has lived on the eastside and in Seattle for 6 years each. He said he has attended most of the Citizen Committee meetings. He said he is opposed to Alternative 3 because it is not a cost effective use of resources. He said that he objects to the Cost Benefits Study of what Alternative 3 is based on because it looks only 20 years into the future. Mr. Sahni pointed out that this is too short a time frame. He said this is not even looking beyond our lifetimes and only two years beyond how long it will take to construct the improvements.

Mr. Sahni said that more emphasis on mass transit would be more cost effective in the long run. He said the Cost Benefits Study did not adequately calculate mass transit because it was analyzed the same way as cars. However, people use their time spent in buses and trains constructively by doing work or reading, which they can't do while driving. He said another objection to the study is it ignores who will pay for a project that is more than twice as much as Sound Transit's Link Light Rail. He argued that if car drivers, the consumers of road capacity, had to pay for usage, the study results would be different because more people would choose to leave their cars at home during peak hours.

Jim Hutchinson of the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce and Downtown Association was the third public speaker. He thanked the committee for the public outreach that has allowed him to get support from Kirkland, Issaquah, Redmond, Woodinville, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, North Shore and Bellevue. He noted that all of the cities prefer Alternative 3. He said that the chambers on the eastside represent over 4000 business members and all of these employees use I-405 in one way or another. He said people will comment about the program price but he has been told that a vision without funding is a fantasy. He assured the committee that the chambers would try and make the vision a reality. He urged the committee to vote for Alternative 3.

Dave Russell, representing the Sensible Solutions Coalition, was the fourth public speaker. He said there is much evidence that the community can't build its way out of congestion by simply adding general-purpose lanes. He said this would end up being a losing proposition. The DEIS shows only a disappointing two hours of reduction in congestion. He said Sensible Solutions has put forth a hybrid solution. He asked the committee to consider expanded TDM as part of the improvements if they choose Alternative 3. He said this would be the most effective use of public investment. Secondly, he asked the committee to preserve the BNSF ROW as an alternative for the future. Lastly, he asked them to commit one GP lane as a managed lane. He asserted that if the commitment isn't made now, it would never be made.

John Healy of 1000 Friends of Washington and member of Sensible Solutions spoke next. He asked the committee to not ignore the public. He said that 1,700 public comments were submitted as part of the process of which many support "Alternative 5". He said that to vote without considering and responding to the comments would be a rush in judgment. He said he doesn't believe anyone has even received a response to their comments. He asked the committee to postpone their decision on the preferred alternative until they have considered all the comments.

The next speaker, Peter Hurley of Transportation Choices and Sensible Solutions, said he read in yesterday's paper that the committee has already made a decision. He said that the program asked people to comment but none have received a response. He asked that before the committee makes a decision, they take the opportunity to make a substantive response. He asked the committee to take the time to "do it right" and perform an evaluation regarding the comments from the public.

Mr. Hurley also encouraged the committee to tighten down the program's fiscal size. He stated that Alternative 3 is not financially realistic, in light of the money needed for other regional projects. He said there are dramatic impacts on individuals if the program moves ahead with the \$7 billion project that will include 10 to 18 lanes in downtown Bellevue and the displacement of homes. He asserted that the costs include \$1000 per square foot of asphalt/concrete. He said these are dramatic economic impacts.

David Hunter, a resident of Kenndale Hill, asked the committee to not put extra lanes on Kenndale Hill. He said there is already a great deal of noise. He encouraged the committee to continue not considering the addition of extra lanes.

Emilio Cantu, a member of the Citizen Committee, was the last public speaker. He said that it is important to continue talking about the process. He said the process thus far has been open and all have had the opportunity to present ideas. Staff took every comment and recorded the meeting minutes as part of the comprehensive process. He also said the staff included a cross-section of the public in the Citizen

Committee. He noted that the program did a good job of defining the problem. He warned that any solution that doesn't meet true demand will force traffic to move onto residential streets.

Mr. Cantu said there is much analysis that documenting the effectiveness of the alternatives. He said the majority of the Citizen Committee supports Alternative 3. He urged the committee to specify that the program will "build 2 lanes" and not "up to 2 lanes" in regards to the extra GP lanes. He said this will affect the program's chances of receiving funding and the program will also receive more support from the public for any future projects. He urged the committee to establish precise definitions of what they intend to do.

This closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Somers asked to comment before proceeding with the meeting. He said he was disappointed to read what the committee's decision is going to be in the local newspapers.

Chairman Kargianis said that the no decision has been made despite what the papers were reporting.

Mr. Somers said he has been involved with NEPA and SEPA analysis for many years. And believes there has been an erosion of public confidence in the government. He said it is a further erosion of public trust if the program asks for public comments but doesn't take the time to respond and look at them before making a decision. He said he doesn't see a benefit in rushing to make the decision today without looking at public comments first. He said it's important that the program has the public's confidence when the decision is made.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 30, 2001 MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting notes were approved after a revision per Mr. Putter's quote on page 11.

SCHEDULE UPDATE

Chairman Kargianis said that it has been the program's rule to make itself open to public comment. He said the intention is to consider all input from all members of the public as well as other committees, municipalities and public bodies that are serviced by the corridor. He said that the challenge today is to provide for future economic growth and security in this area. Transportation is an essential part of life and without it, this area can't proceed, survive and prosper.

Chairman Kargianis handed the meeting's lead to Mr. Cummings.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Schedule Update.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the preferred alternative decision process. He said the staff is looking for a decision from the Executive Committee today on a preferred alternative. Concurrence forms will be sent out in March, 2002 to all agencies.

FEEDBACK ON PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Draft – Conditions For Support:

- Minimize construction impacts on mobility and communities.
- Meet local, state and federal design guidelines and regulations.
- Develop funding strategy for inclusion in the MTP.

- Ensure community support through project level environmental review and public involvement.
- Phase projects so that TDM, transit and bottleneck improvements are made first.
- Environmental conditions (see handout)

Mr. Cummings said the Steering and Citizen Committee members would be given the opportunity to give their overall comments of their recommendation at today's meeting. There will be opportunities for both those in support of the recommendation and those that disagree. Mr. Cummings said he would also ask the members if they have comments as he reviews the recommendation components.

Mr. Paylor said the program should provide assurance that it isn't building something in the first five years that won't be implemented for another 10 years. He asked if the sequence of phasing is included in the conditions for support? He said there should be immediate benefit as soon as the improvements are completed.

Chairman Kargianis said the Program has considered phasing. He said the concept for funding is that construction will be done simultaneously on many fronts.

Mr. Cummings said all projects have to have to be able to stand on their own and have a logical starting and ending point.

Chairman Kargianis said summaries of the committees' recommendations have already been passed out. Mr. Cummings repeated that Citizen and Steering Committee members can make comments or ask questions as they review the individual elements.

Ms. Cothorn asked if the Draft Conditions of Support is from the resource agencies. Mr. Cummings said issues started showing up on each element when staff was going through the comments, so they started to combine them. He said the Steering Committee working group of resource agencies and local jurisdictions began to put together concepts of what might go with the PA. These are in the handout as draft discussion points.

Ms. McBride asked about the status of resource agency concurrence forms? Mr. Cummings said concurrent forms will be sent out in March 2002. He said the program still has a long way to go with the resource agencies. He said staff has made agreements with the Steering Committee on how to deal with concurrency and is meeting with them frequently to talk through issues. Mr. Cummings said there are Steering Committee members present at today's meeting.

Ms. McBride said she sees the potential for problems later if resource agencies deny or amend the preferred alternative. She said she's worried about the process.

Chairman Kargianis said the PMT has been in direct communication with resource agencies regarding the process. He said the Executive Committee is open to their input and will continue to work with agencies on any problems that they come up with. He said they would request a response on the concurrence forms to be sent out in March.

Ms. Marshall said she knows how most cities feel, but she hasn't heard from resource agencies in months. She asked where the resource agencies are in the process.

Mr. Cummings said today's presentation will address this question.

Terry Swanson, representing the Dept. of Ecology, said the draft being reviewed by the resource agencies now includes conditions for support of a preferred alternative developed by a subcommittee of the Steering Committee. She said they are dedicated to working closely with WSDOT and local jurisdictions to come up with solutions for transportation program that doesn't impact the environment too much.

Mary Alyce Burleigh, a Citizen Committee member, said she was asked by the minority caucus to present their point of view, said the Citizen Committee reached a general consensus on several elements. However, the minority caucus believes that Alternative 3 focuses too narrowly on GP lanes. She said they should provide a wider range of options including preservation of the BNSF, managed lanes and long trails.

She said the minority caucus also supports some options as part of a regional strategy, including HCT in the core area. She said the Citizen Committee is split on tolls, but the minority caucus recommends lane balancing south of I-90 and the study of tolls. She said the I-405 program should provide a wider range of alternatives that will be more capable of meeting demand.

She said the minority caucus is concerned with environmental impacts. She's a resident that lives along I-405 and is concerned about the quality of life, loss of homes, and increased pollution that won't be 100 percent mitigated.

She said the funding issue is up in the air and is concerned with the fiscal element. Ms. Burleigh urged the Executive Committee to support more cost effective alternatives that are more sensitive to the environment and can be done in a shorter amount of time. She said, most of all, she would like an alternative that looks to the future and not just at the technology of the 20th century to solve problems. She said the program needs to move people and goods, not just vehicles.

Janet Ray, Citizen Committee member, said the I-405 Corridor Program is the most collaborative and inclusive process she's been involved with. She said there has been a great range of movement over the two years and various divergent viewpoints have come to a center position that Alternative 3 is good and meets the needs of all users in the corridor while addressing congestion and the needs of businesses. She said that I-405 is an economic generator and if congestion isn't dealt with, there won't be any businesses remaining in the corridor. She noted that she is speaking from the majority opinion side, but is not their spokesperson. She said that Alternative 3 is a balanced approach.

Corrine Hensley, Citizen Committee member, said she doesn't agree with Alternative 3 and never has. She said she would like Alternative 1 and is a firm believer in the Growth Management Act (GMA). She noted she's the single individual on the Citizen Committee representing an environmental organization.

She said the problem with Alternative 3 is that it's a lot of money for a short-term solution. She said it doesn't get you where you want to go and it doesn't increase mobility. She said when the Executive Committee is looking at the vision, they need to also look at visions for their own jurisdictions, transportation needs and land use needs and whether the program is meeting job/housing ratio targets. She said that good communities have a balance between jobs and housing and residents don't have to drive somewhere to get to work, the store, or schools. Ms. Hensley asked for a program that includes more transit and some type of rail. She also encouraged better shuttle service going to and from the airport.

She said that cities need to commit to the GMA, transit and land use. If they need to make improvements, they should do it and not shrug off their GMA duties by passing it along to citizens. Nobody wants to pay new taxes. She said she isn't sure if the program will receive much public support. She said the program should look at solutions that really fix problems and will provide benefits that will last longer than 15 to 17 years. She warned that as soon as the project is done, they would be back to square one.

Jonathan Freedman, EPA and Steering Committee member, said one of its conditions for the preferred alternative is adaptive project management and phasing. He said they would like the program to do the least impacting components first to minimize environmental damage. He said it might possible to achieve the goals without the full build out. He asked that the program complete the non-construction elements first and then go to problem areas such as adding new lanes.

He said the EPA strongly supports looking at managed lanes. They are concerned that public input is being given much less time and consideration than normal. He said the program has received a tremendous amount of public and agency comments. EPA supports that the concurrence point has been moved back.

However, Mr. Freedman said the Executive Committee is being asked to make a decision before the agencies can look at its response to comments. The Steering and resource agency subgroup has stressed the need for more information on technical analysis and since they don't have the opportunity to review the responses, he can't say they will be able to concur in the future. However, they have been actively engaged with the citizens and local jurisdictions. He said he is available for questions.

Terra Hegy, representative for Fish and Wildlife and Steering Committee member, urged the Executive Committee to be responsive to the public. She said the agency doesn't feel they've had adequate time for a response and requested a delay in the concurrency point. She urged the Executive Committee to look at the elements/impacts and at "Alternative 5" that has some good ideas. She said her agency doesn't advocate any one alternative but suggestions will be helpful to them when looking at the alternatives.

She said creativity is also important. Their project could be a landmark if the commitment is there. She asked the program should look at new environmental techniques and get to salmon recovery. She said they would keep working with staff on conditions for preferred alternative concurrence. She said her agency was involved in drafting some of the conditions presented earlier.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Preferred Alternative Recommendation Process:

- Motion on preferred alternative.
- Review and approve consensus elements.
- Describe each remaining element; clarifying questions.
- Overview of Steering and Citizen Committee PA recommendations.
- Amendments/modifications.
- Discussion -- record issues and comments.
- If no clear consensus, vote on elements to include in the preferred alternative.

Mr. Cummings said that when the PMT worked with the other committees on developing a recommendation, they built it from the ground up. However, he suggested that if the Executive Committee wants to put a motion on the table for the PA, then they could go through the remaining elements and deal with them as

amendments to the first motion. He asked if the committee had a preference for an approach.

Ms. Marshall made a motion that the Executive Committee approves Alternative 3. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Cummings said he will note the elements that are outside of Alternative 3 and the committee will have a choice to amend and bring the element into the PA. For example, managed lanes weren't in Alternative 3.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Voting Process: Operating Guidelines – adopted in late 1999:

- Goal is to strive for consensus.
- A vote will be taken only if group cannot reach consensus.
- Need 60% vote of members or alternates present to make decisions.
- Minority perspectives will be recognized and documented.

Chairman Kargianis noted that committee has been operating on a consensus basis. He also announced that Vice-chair McKenna wishes to apologize for not being at today's meeting. He has sent his comments.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the process to recommend a Preferred Alternative:

- Opportunity to amend/modify elements of preferred alternative during meeting.
- Key issues will also be discussed.
- Motion approved at conclusion of meeting.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the PA Consensus Elements:

- #1- TDM Package
- #2- Transit Expansion
- #4- Arterial HOV Priority
- #5- HOV Lane on I-405 with Direct Access Ramps
- #6- Add Park and Ride Capacity to Match Demand
- #7- Add Transit Center Capacity to Match Demand
- #8 - Basic I-405 Improvements
- #12- Add Collector Distributor lanes on I-405 where needed
- #14- SR 167 / 405 Interchange improvements
- #15- Improve Connecting Freeway Capacity to I-405
- #16- Implement planned arterial improvements
- #17- Expand Capacity on North-South Arterials
- #18- Upgrade Connecting Arterial Connections to I-405
- #19– Corridor Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
- #20– Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements
- #21– Corridor Freight Enhancements

**Resource agencies abstained from voting on some or all elements.*

Mr. Cummings said these elements have been compiled from previous committee meetings. He said he would pause for any amendments at each element.

Senator Horn asked for clarification of the TDM package. Mr. Cummings said pricing strategies have been broken out for separate consideration. He said the description is in the workbook.

Chairman Kargianis suggested Senator Horn review the package description and the Committee return to the issue later.

Mr. Cummings noted that the TDM package is the same as was included in the preliminary preferred alternative.

Ms. Marshall asked if they need a motion to approve the PA Consensus Elements as a package. Mr. Cummings said they are part of Alternative 3 already, so they only need to make a motion if they want to amend an element.

Chairman Kargianis said that unless there's a specific motion to amend or strike one of the elements, they have already been approved by the original motion.

Mr. Paine asked if there would be discussion on the other elements later. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Ms. McBride said that Kirkland hasn't taken a stand on #4. She this element may go forward and she will not make an objection, but she would like to note that Kirkland hasn't yet made a decision.

No amendments or modifications were requested to the consensus elements list.

Remaining Elements/Issues:

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)

- #1a - Expanded TDM Package (Regional Pricing Through PSRC)

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT (HCT)

- #3a,3b, 3c - Fixed Guideway, Commuter Rail, or BRT
- High Capacity Transit: Study Fixed Guideway in Central Core Area

ROADWAY CAPACITY

- #9, 10, 11 - Add General Purpose Lanes Each Direction on I-405
- Lane Balance: Third Lane South of I-90
- #13 - Widen SR 167 by up to 2 lanes Each Direction

OTHER ELEMENTS

- Preservation of BNSF Right-of-Way for Future Transportation Opps.
- Managed Lanes: Manage up to 2 Lanes Each Direction
- Managed Lanes: Utilize Tolls as a Management Tools

NON-MOTORIZED

- #19 – Long Trails for Pedestrians and Bicycles

TDM Regional Pricing Issue:

- PSRC Pricing Task Force recommends pricing be included as part of Destination 2030
- Pricing to be used for:
 - Financing transportation infrastructure
 - Improve efficiency of transportation
- Conduct pricing demonstration program prior to 2006
- Specific pricing strategies are not prescribed

Elements of Regional Pricing:

- Region-wide congestion pricing
- Fuel Taxes
- Mileage Charges (such as a VMT fee)
- Parking Charges
- Tolls (will be discussed in the context of 'managed lanes')

Mr. Cummings said the toll issue is being pulled out and the Executive Committee will deal with it separately under the managed lanes element.

Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Citizen Committee generally divided.
 - Pricing offers long-term sustainability.
 - Most "market-like approach"
 - Concerns about public perception.
 - Unfairly penalizes corridor if not done on regional basis.
- Steering Committee consensus: "Support use-based pricing in region as part of regional strategy."

Mr. Cummings asked if committee members had any comments to add? There were no comments.

Regional Pricing Options to Consider:

- #1 – Support consideration of use-based pricing on I-405 as part of regional strategy.
- #2 – I-405 Program will not make recommendation on pricing, which is appropriate for regional discussion--not at a corridor-level.

Mr. Cummings said the Citizen Committee supported #1 with the underlined words. The Steering Committee supported the element with the underlined words taken out.

Mr. Davis said he thinks regional pricing is going to be a regional issue probably decided by voters. He said it's likely the I-405 Corridor Program will not be financed without this strategy. He said the program will not be able to raise enough taxes on its own to build the improvements. He said Option #1 isn't about voting yes or no, it just recognizes regional pricing is there.

Mr. Somers agreed with Mr. Davis.

Mr. Edwards said the Puget Sound Regional Council agreed that pricing should be included in Destination 2030. He asked the committee to ensure that all future corridor expansion look at pricing and said that the I-405 Corridor Program is the first major corridor process that has come to the point of making a decision on this. He said the program should stick with the original regional plan. He also noted that resource agencies want this to be a part of the plan.

Mr. Edwards pointed out that regional pricing is also a creative option and will help raise funds while effecting the times and places people will travel.

Senator Horn said that he supports Option #2 because regional pricing will be done at the regional or state level. He said that after the committee issues a PA, the focus will shift to Olympia and he doesn't want to put additional issues or problems onto the project. He urged the committee to keep the program as simple and as close to the EIS as possible. He urged that the Executive Committee keep the controversial elements away from the program. He said that whether or not the program includes regional pricing, it will be considered by the region, so why include it in the program?

Ms. Pflug agreed that Option 2 is best. She said voting for Option #2 would not preclude using regional pricing in the future. It's unnecessary for this project to make a statement.

Mr. Putter asked which wording for Option #1 the committee is considering? Mr. Cummings said that if there is not a motion to amend, then the PA will include Option #2 by default. He said that if there is a motion to amend, the committee would pick the language to include.

Mr. Somers said he is in favor of Option #1. He said that part of the program should be suggesting solutions for financing the project. Regional pricing is a regional issue, but this will be one of largest projects in the region and the committee has an obligation to suggest ways to finance it.

Ms. McBride said she is in support of Option #1. However, she would like clarification on the wording. Mr. Cummings said the Steering Committee took out the underlined words. The Citizen Committee was fairly divided between the two options.

Ms. McBride said this is a modest proposal and all it talks about is consideration of regional pricing. Citizens will want them to look at pricing consideration.

Ms. McBride made a motion to support Option #1 as is. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Paine said Redmond also favors Option #1. He said the council is in favor of this type of progressive approach.

Senator Prentice said she supports Option #1. She said the program should go on the record that they are supporting this kind of pricing and recognize that it should be part of a regional strategy.

Mr. Putter said he supports the Steering Committee's wording. He said it's vitally important that the region examine the feasibility of regional pricing but also feels strongly that the program will hamper itself if we try to hang the concept on the I-405 Corridor Program. He said the region should advise feasibility as a separate study, not as this one. He said the region should come to a consensus first, not make this program make a decision first.

Mr. Paylor said he favors the Steering Committee's recommendation and thinks that due to funding issues, the concept should be studied at the regional level. However, he said they should clarify that they would not support pricing to the extent that it's used as a TDM measure. Pricing would be a TDM stick. He said it worthwhile to take a position for the record so it's shown that regional pricing was discussed.

Mr. Mullet said he favors the Steering Committee's position as well.

Senator Horn said he doesn't have a problem with regional pricing being studied. However, do they really want to add it to this EIS? He reminded the committee that everything has to be passed by a bipartisan vote. He said that putting this statement into the program will start an argument that is not needed and will jeopardize the program's chance to get to the funding stage.

Senator Horn said regional pricing is a policy issue that doesn't need to be raised at the EIS stage. He said that PSRC has already said they will be willing to help with the study.

Ms. Marshall said she's heard a consensus and wants to include Option #1 with the underlined words removed. She said the inclusion would signal the need for a thorough regional examination and it would be a positive statement that it needs to be looked at on a regional level. She said that it is a modest statement of support.

Ms. McBride said she had made a motion to amend and her motion was seconded.

Ms. Pflug said she's not at the point of consensus. She said they need to take a reasonable look at funding. If the committee were to look back at the Purpose and

Needs statement, we would find we don't have the responsibility to look at funding. She said this is not in our charter and the committee has a responsibility to not create any barriers that get in the way of funding. She warned that this statement would add a red flag to the program that will make funding more difficult.

Chairman Kargianis asked how the program can send a message that use-based pricing is a good idea on a region-wide basis? Does it have to be part of an adoption or can it be a statement made in passing? Mr. Cummings said this would be a policy statement from the group.

Chairman Kargianis said this would not attach any use conditions on the program.

Senator Horn said it would become part of the debate, though.

Ms. McBride said the committee is very close to a consensus. She reiterated that this is a modest proposal that should be a part of all transportation plans. She said this element is a modest statement that regional pricing deserves to be looked at. She said she's ready to move on to the number of other serious issues to deal with today.

Mr. Corman said he's concerned about Senator Horn's comments. If he's saying there is a big debate about this concept in Olympia, than the I-405 Corridor Program is stepping right into it. He said he's starting to agree this isn't where the program wants to go. He said he's an advocate of showing they are willing too look at all types of funding but thinks they don't have to nail down this particular concept.

Mr. Okamoto said he's uncomfortable with both options.

Chairman Kargianis said the committee may be taking lot of time on this, but it may also be really important.

Mr. Okamoto said he's perplexed by the nature of this debate. PSRC is going forward with the pricing study regardless of their vote. He said he believes it's appropriate to study the concept as part of a regional strategy. However, he's also sensitive to the Legislature's concerns that in order to get the program through the Legislature they don't want to put unnecessary baggage on it.

Mr. Okamoto said he's uncomfortable with Option #2 because if they are successful in getting funding at all, they may need to come back and look for funding as a specific corridor. He said his choice would be to remain silent on this issue.

Chairman Kargianis said he is increasingly concerned that if this is included it may impact or derail their efforts for funding. He said both options leave a little to be desired. He asked if the program should simply state that used-based pricing is appropriate for regional discussion but not at the corridor level? He asked what the committee thinks?

Mr. Paine said they are basically talking about TDM. However, there is the controversy of funding. He said this simple sentence is saying the program is willing to swallow a potentially divisive and positive TDM measure.

Mr. Taniguchi said he is in support of Option #1.

Mr. Paylor said he would not feel very good if they are silent about this. He said he doesn't want to include this option.

Mr. Davis warned that the program would not be able to have regional pricing if the Legislature doesn't authorize it. He said that any regional structure that doesn't include regional pricing would not be giving them the full package. He said the committee needs to keep it on the table.

Senator Prentice said she disagrees the element will taint the program. She believes it will carry moral authority if she can go back to the Legislature and say the program supports regional pricing.

Mr. Edwards said the statement the committee would be making is that we are willing to accept pricing for a TDM and funding strategy. It doesn't mean we're saying we have to have it.

Ms. Pflug reminded them that a regional strategy is still very tenuous in Olympia. She said she's not sure they have the support of the regional funding mechanism. She said they have a sales job just to sell the idea of a regional strategy. She asked if there is room for a compromise in the statement? Can they just say that the program doesn't oppose regional pricing instead of saying they support it?

Chairman Kargianis called for a vote on the motion in favor of Option #1 to "support use-based pricing as part of regional strategy."

There were 10 votes to support the motion (9 needed to pass); the motion passed.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 10 votes) - Expanded TDM Program: Pricing Strategies

Executive Committee Recommendation: "Support use-based pricing in region as part of regional strategy." (Region should examine feasibility as part of separate study.)

High Capacity Transit Elements:

- Fixed Guideway
- Commuter Rail
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Steering Committee: Significant majority support "BRT as preferred alternative. Do not include fixed guideway in PA; recommend Sound Transit analyze it in Phase II planning."
 - Minority support for commuter rail and fixed guideway.
- Citizen Committee: Significant majority support BRT.
 - Minority support for commuter rail and fixed guideway.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Fixed Guideway in I-405: City of Redmond:

- Staff asked to bring issue back to Executive Committee (10/30).
- City of Redmond Resolution No. 1138:

- 1.Fixed-guideway high capacity transit for the entire length of I-405 should be studied concurrently to establish a more complete long-term vision for the corridor.
- 2.The concurrent study needs to consider locating fixed-guideway high capacity transit within the existing right-of-way for I-405.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Fixed Guideway: Study Evolution:

- Concurrence Point #2: Selected transit elements for EIS analysis.

- Fixed guideway included in Alts 1 & 2:
- Connect to centers
- BNSF Alignment for most of corridor
- Portions of fixed guideway operate within or adjacent to I-405.
- Rationale: BNSF alignment provided good connections to centers; I-405 alignment posed some design and operational issues
- Specific alignment would be worked out during Sound Transit Phase II planning (core area east-west travel)

Fixed Guideway within I-405: Issues:

- Is it a reasonable option?
- Requires 10-20 feet of width for columns.
- Additional right-of-way would likely be required in several locations.
- Station locations in I-405 ROW?
- Costs, performance and environmental impacts have not been fully estimated.
- Could trigger return to previous concurrence point and supplemental EIS.

HCT Options to Consider:

#1: Support Commuter Rail; use BNSF Alignment (Alts 1,2)

#2: (A) Support BRT (Alt 3); ensure sustainability within HOV system.

(B) Support BRT (Alt. 3); Do not include fixed guideway in PA; recommend Sound Transit study it in Phase II planning.

#3: Support Fixed Guideway:

- Use BNSF Alignment (Alts 1,2)
- In I-405 Right-of-Way

Mr. Putter asked for clarification on Option 2a's additional language. Mr. Cummings said it meant that WSDOT would work with service providers to insure adequate speed is maintained in the corridor.

Mr. Putter said Option 3 provides for BRT and HOV 3+ operating in the same lane. What happens when capacity does not ensure the 45 mph? Mr. Cummings said that during peak periods they may go to 4+ in the future.

Mr. Cummings said this is when it starts to tie into the issue of managed lanes. Mr. Putter asked if the additional language is really an issue of a managed lanes discussion rather than BRT?

Mr. Cummings said they've heard concerns about HOV being used for BRT. If they commit to this system, they want to ensure speed and reliability. He said that if the committee wants to separate out the issue, they could.

Mr. Putter asked if it means BRT would take precedence? Mr. Cummings said yes. He said Option 2 would be in the context of and is consistent with the main motion.

Mr. Somers asked what the main motion is. Mr. Cummings said Alternative 3 is the main motion and Option 2 would be the closest to the main motion.

Mr. Putter asked if the main motion would support BRT if the committee didn't consider any of these options? Mr. Cummings said it would.

Ms. McBride said Kirkland has supported BRT as some sort of HCT. However, they feel it needs to be on its own separate lane. She said she's concerned about the "rapid" part. She said she didn't know they had decided it would go on an HOV lane.

Ms. McBride said she's concerned that a vote for Option #2 will close off the idea that BRT can be on a managed lane. Kirkland would like HCT treatment to be on its own lane to ensure a rapid system.

She asked what will happen if the committee votes for Option #2? Mr. Cummings said the Alternative 3 analyzed in the DEIS was operating in a 3+ HOV lane.

Ms. McBride asked if they would still be able to fold BRT into it if they decide later to add a managed lane? Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Somers said Redmond has asked for an assessment of a fixed-guideway. He said Redmond is in partial support of Option 2b. He asked if it is a stand-alone amendment? Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Somers asked if another EIS or a supplemental would apply to this element. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Ms. McBride asked for clarification on where BRT will operate for Option 2b. Mr. Somers said in the existing HOV lane.

Mr. Putter asked Mr. Somers if the program is precluded from including the study of HCT within the core area if they propose Option 2b. Mr. Somers said this is a separate issue.

Mr. Paine said his council supported Option 3. They felt there is a need to look at the big picture in terms of the future of transportation in the area. He said even if there is a time delay, by including this, we would have laid some groundwork and a development plan for the next generation. He motioned to support Option #3.

Ms. Somers seconded the motion.

Ms. McBride said she still supports Option 2b. She said Sound Transit has already decided to look at Option 2b.

Mr. O'Sullivan, Sound Transit, said they will be initiating Phase 2 of the alternative analysis sometime in the next 20 years and this will be one of the items. He said it would include a variety of alternatives.

Mr. Mullet asked if Option #3 supports BRT in addition? Chairman Kargianis said it only approves using the BNSF and having it in the I-405 ROW.

Chairman Kargianis asked the members which alternative they are supporting? Mr. Paine said they are supporting both. If the BNSF goes down, they will still have the second option.

Mr. Mullet asked if this is in addition to what is already in the PA. Chairman Kargianis said yes.

Mr. Okamoto asked if the element of HCT in the core area is next on the agenda. Mr. Cummings said yes. Mr. Okamoto said this is a vote that's coming up next.

Senator Horn opposed the motion. He said it is just attaching more controversial issues to the program.

Mr. Paylor said he also does not support the option. He said that if a fixed-guideway makes sense later, they could always take the middle lanes out for it. He said he doesn't want to plan based on today's technology and reserve it for something we don't even know if we can use.

Mr. Mullet said he also doesn't support the motion – he believes BRT is the answer.

Mr. Putter said he does not support the motion. BRT is a viable solution in lower density areas. He said he supports the study of a fixed-guideway within the core area between Kirkland and south of Bellevue considering this is where the most intense transit is predicted to be most effective. He said he also supports the BNSF preservation. If the intensity of development within the urban area is more than projected, than BRT is a precursor to something of higher intensity in terms of a fixed guideway. He argued that based on their comprehensive plans, fixed guideway is not yet merited.

The motion to amend Alternative #3 to include Option #3 did not pass.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by consensus) - High Capacity Transit: BRT

Executive Committee Recommendation: "BRT is preferred High Capacity Transit strategy."

Central Core HCT Concept

Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Steering Committee: Reached consensus to study HCT in Central Core area.
- Citizen Committee: Evenly divided on issue.
 - Offers connection to Translake
 - Look at issue if BRT does not work out.

Mr. Cummings said HCT is primary for east-west travel in the corridor across Lake Washington.

Central Core HCT Options to Consider:

- #1 – Continued study of fixed guideway in central core area in concert with Trans-Lake and Sound Transit Phase 2 studies.
- #2 – Do not recommend further study.

Mr. Cummings noted that this element is not part of Alternative 3. Mr. Putter asked how Alternative 3 is currently stated. Mr. Cummings said it is silent on the issue.

Mr. Putter made a motion to adopt Option 1. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Putter said there is a high capacity corridor within the region. He argued that this is something that will be very effective for the study. When Sound Transit looks at Phase 2, they consider this corridor to need HCT. He said this element needs to be worked into the I-405 Corridor Program.

Mr. Cummings said this element recognizes our relationship with the connections that come across the lake.

Mr. Marshall said she supports Option #1 because Trans-Lake is already studying this and therefore it doesn't need to be an issue with this committee.

The committee voted to add Option 1 to Alternative #3, which passed with 12 votes.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 12 votes) – Study HCT in Central Core Area

Executive Committee Recommendation: "Continue study of fixed guideway in central core area in concert with Trans-Lake and Sound Transit Phase 2 studies."

I-405 Roadway Capacity Elements:

No Added Lanes

- Alt. #2: Add 1 lane each direction*
- Alt. #3: Add 2 lanes each direction*
- Alt. #4: Add 3 lanes each direction*

*Note: Each would include additional auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes.

Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Steering Committee: Significant majority support adding up to two lanes
 - Small minority support adding no lanes; environmental concerns cited.
- Citizen Committee: Significant majority support adding two lanes.
 - Minority support adding one lane; environmental impacts and cost concerns cited.
 - Little support for adding three lanes.

I-405 Roadway Capacity Options:

- No Added Lanes
- Alt. #2: Add 1 lane each direction*
- Alt. #3: Add 2 lanes each direction*
- Alt. #4: Add 3 lanes each direction*

*Note: Each would include additional auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes

Mr. Somers said Alternative 3 includes the language of "up to" x lanes in each direction. Mr. Samdahl said the PPA added the "up to" language but officially Alternative 3, as studied, included 2 lanes without the added language.

Ms. Marshall said the workbook says "up to." Mr. Cummings suggested they make a motion so their intent and language is clear.

Mr. Cummings said staff made clear at the Citizen Committee meeting that they are not suggesting 2 lanes in each direction in a couple of locations.

Chairman Kargianis said "up to" would authorize 2 lanes. Mr. Cummings said yes. He said they want to be clear that there are some locations where it may not be cost effective to add 2 complete lanes.

Senator Horn said they are basically adding 2 lanes in each direction. Mr. Cummings said this is correct.

Senator Horn said there are also certain sections where there will be more than 2 lanes. "Up to" doesn't say the same thing as just 2 lanes.

A motion was made in support of Option 3. The motion was seconded.

Ms. McBride said Kirkland has agreed on the "up to" language and their statement says this.

Mr. Paylor asked for clarification on the motion. Mr. Cummings said the motion is for 2 lanes, not "up to 2 lanes."

Mr. Paylor said he supports "up to." This could be in addition or include climbing lanes. Mr. Cummings said they are currently talking about main-line lanes.

Mr. Dye said they are talking about basic lanes added to I-405. The intent was 2 basic lanes added to I-405 plus additional auxiliary lanes. He said that in some cases, freeway-to freeway connections need additional auxiliary lanes. He said there needs to be extra capacity in certain locations to make the system work. He noted that the vast majority of trips in the corridor are shorter. If 2 lanes aren't warranted in certain areas, they will not build 2 lanes.

Mr. Somers said he is concerned they are going in circles. He argued that you couldn't build your way out of congestion. He said they need to look at different solutions.

Ms. Marshall said she has been under the impression that this discussion has always been inside of Alternative 3 and of adding up to 2 lanes. It doesn't fit in some areas, so if they say "add 2 lanes" is there a mandate that you have to add 2 lanes in the corridor? If not, then they should say "up to" so it implies that they don't have to add the lanes if unnecessary.

Mr. Okamoto suggested making an amendment and adding, "up to 2 mainline lanes." Each would include additional auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes. He made a motion for this amendment. Ms. Marshall seconded the motion.

The amendment to Alternative #3 to include "up to 2 mainline lanes" and each would include additional auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes passed with 14 votes in support.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 14 votes) – I-405 Expansion: Add up to 2 main line lanes

Executive Committee Recommendation: "Add up to two main line lanes in each direction to I-405. Include additional auxiliary, truck climbing and collector/distributor lanes to improve operational efficiencies as needed."

Freeway Lane Balance Issue: Added Lane South of I-90:

- With two added lanes along corridor, congestion remains in south end
- Additional study (south of I-90) looked at:
 - +3 lanes
 - Auxiliary and truck climbing lanes

Citizen and Steering Recommendation Overview:

- Steering Committee reached consensus: Do not support adding 3rd lane south of I-90.

- Support for collector/distributor and auxiliary lanes.
- Citizen Committee: Significant majority support: "Study adding up to three lanes south of I-90."
- Minority opposed, citing environmental and community impacts.

Mr. Cummings said the Steering Committee's vote is consistent with Alternative 3.

Lane Balance Options: Added Lanes in South End:

- Option 1: Study adding up to 3 lanes from I-90 to Tukwila.
- Option 2: Do not add 3rd lane.

Note: Under Option 2, collector/distributor and auxiliary lanes could be added in appropriate locations

Mr. Putter said he would like to study hill-climbing lanes and auxiliary lanes in the I-90/Park Drive segment which is not in either of the options. Mr. Putter's motion was seconded.

Mr. Putter said that under the transportation section of the EIS, there is an improvement in congestion over the entire corridor except for in this section. He asked if this would be a chokepoint? He proposed that this study continue and the committee give staff authorization to continue to the study. He said that if preliminary data is correct, they could solve the problem without a third lane.

Ms. McBride asked Mr. Putter how long the corridor is? He said maybe 3 or 4 miles. He said he's talking about I-90 down to Park Drive. He said the area from SR167 to 1-5 isn't the major point of congestion.

Mr. Corman said Renton recognizes hill-climbing lanes over Kenneydale Hill has a great deal of community impact. However, he said the Steering Committee and staff have come up with a good approach through a Steering recommendation that will resolve these issue with as little impact to the community as possible.

Mr. Corman said he favors the Steering Committee recommendation but doesn't know if he is supposed to vote or not do anything.

Chairman Kargianis said this element is in addition.

Mr. Putter said the program should study the use of these lanes, not just build them. He said he wants to see what can be done and wants to ensure they don't approve a plan with a chokepoint.

Mr. Corman asked if a motion is required if the Steering consensus language is satisfactory.

Mr. Okamoto suggested the issue is addressed under the previous vote on adding mainline lanes to I-405. Each would include additional auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes. Therefore no vote or amendment is needed. Mr. Putter agreed and withdrew his motion.

FAILED ELEMENT (by consensus) – Lane Balance: 3rd Lane South of I-90

Executive Committee Recommendation: "Do not include 3rd lane south of I-90 in preferred alternative." (Consideration of additional auxiliary, truck climbing and collector/distributor lanes is addressed above under I-405 expansion.)

SR 167 Capacity Improvements

SR 167 Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Steering Committee: A majority support adding up to two lanes
 - Minority support no lanes, citing environmental impact concerns.
- Citizen Committee: Significant majority support adding two lanes.
 - Minority support adding one lane or no lanes, citing environmental concerns.

Ms. Marshall said the workbook only says add 2 lanes, without the “up to” language. She said that if the committee amends this element, they will be adding the words “up to.”

Ms. McBride said when the program first looked at SR 167, the resource agencies had recommended no lanes. However, the Steering Committee then went through a review and recommended one lane. So, wasn't the program just going to add one lane? Ms. McBride said the workbook implies “up to.”

Mr. Cummings said, again, the committee should make a motion so they can have clarity on the language.

Ms. Marshall made a motion for Option #1 including the “up to” language. Mr. Corman seconded the motion.

Senator Horn said the language should say “up to 2 mainline lanes.”

Mr. Putter said he supports Senator Horn's motion. He said that if they are to finance this, they need to recognize the importance of SR 167 and I-405 as one and the same.

Ms. McBride asked what the motion means. Does it support up to 2 mainline lanes? Will we still be using the asterisk from the slide? Mr. Cummings said yes.

The motion would modify Alternative #3 to “add up to two mainline lanes” each direction to SR 167. Each would include additional auxiliary and collector/distributor lanes. The motion passed with 11 votes.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 11 votes) – SR 167 Expansion: Add up to two main line lanes

Executive Committee Recommendation: “Add up to two main line lanes in each direction to SR 167. Include additional auxiliary, truck climbing and collector/distributor lanes as needed. Subject to resolving environmental requirements and terminal points.”

BNSF Right-of-Way Preservation

Mr. Cummings reviewed some background information on the abandonment process:

- The U.S. Surface Transportation Board:

- Determines if BNSF could abandon the line
- If suitable to use for highways, other forms of mass transit, conservation or recreation.
- If the Board determines the rail line is suitable, interested persons would have 180 days to negotiate with the railroad to acquire the property for public use.
- The Board cannot require the railroad to sell its property for public use.

Ms. Pflug asked if the BNSF can sell to the highest bidder, under this process of negotiation, or is there a hierarchy? Mr. Cummings said the hierarchy is based on public use and can't be unreasonable. He said it also probably needs to be near market value.

Chairman Kargianis asked if abandonment means they can stop operating the rail line but they can still hang onto it. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Process to Acquire BNSF:

- 1. The WSDOT Rail Office would take the lead on acquiring the BNSF Woodinville Rail line for public use.
- 2. The WSDOT Rail Office would send a letter of interest and a request for a Public Use Condition to the U.S. Surface Transportation Board.

Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Steering Committee: A majority support actively seeking to preserve property being sold for
 - Core area future HCT uses
 - Balance for bike-pedestrian uses that support transit and other trip reduction opportunities.
 - Long trails, if part of recommendation
- Minority support setting up separate study to look at issue.
- Citizen Committee: Majority do not support preservation, citing lack of definition, community impacts and costs.
 - Strong minority support preservation or setting up separate study, citing bike/ped uses and long-term transit opportunities.

Mr. Cummings noted that this is not part of Alternative 3 and will take a motion to be included in the PA.

BNSF Preservation Options:

- #1: Not include in PA.
- #2: Include in PA:
 - Opportunity to set up separate study to look at future joint use and upgrading opportunities.
- #3: Include in PA:
 - Actively seek to preserve property being sold for
 - Core area future HCT uses
 - Balance for bike-pedestrian uses that support transit and other trip reduction opportunities.
 - Long trails, if part of recommendation

Mr. Cummings said no action would leave out the element entirely from the preferred alternative.

Mr. Somers asked if Option #3 precludes or allows future use of the northern leg for some sort of transit use? Mr. Cummings said this is to actively pursue those portions that are being sold.

Mr. Somers moved for Option 3. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Somers said he believes it is important to try and preserve these properties for transit and pedestrian trail uses. He warned that once they are gone they are lost forever.

Ms. McBride said she also supports Option #3, but Kirkland will be happier if they take out the last two parts. They need to preserve the BNSF but for what is going to be another discussion.

Mr. Somers said he is ok with Ms. McBride's suggested amendment to reword Option #3 to read, "Include BNSF in the PA and actively seek to preserve the property being sold for core area future HCT uses."

Mr. Putter said they are actively seeking the means to go after the rail line right now and if there is property within the ROW being sold, they will try and buy it now. He said he is in favor of preserving the BNSF for future transportation uses but is not in favor of going after it right now.

Mr. Putter said he would like to make a motion to go after the BNSF at the time of abandonment. In order for the program to preserve the corridor, Mr. Putter said they need to give direction.

Senator Horn said he opposes both motions. He said this is an EIS for the configuration of the corridor. Why does the committee keep on trying to attach the program to other issues at this point of the process? He argued that the process or acquirement is already happening, so the program wouldn't be adding anything to it.

Mr. Paylor said he supports Mr. Putter's amendment and wants to add Option #2 to it.

Chairman Kargianis asked who would purchase this property?

Mr. Paine asked if the only option for the corridor is if the BNSF abandons the rail line?

Mr. Okamoto said WSDOT is looking at this and has a statewide and larger interest in seeing freight and passenger rail as a viable route. He said they are not anxious to force a different use of the corridor. He said that at times WSDOT would step in and purchase a short line so it will still be a viable freight route.

He said WSDOT would take actions to preserve the corridor should it be necessary. If not for a passenger or freight route, WSDOT will determine if their intent to preserve the corridor is for transportation purposes. He said he does not support Option 3 because it suggests they are going to push out the current use. He said WSDOT would act on the implications of Mr. Putter's motion regardless if a motion is made.

Mr. Mullet said he is against the motion. He said the program does not have the standing to do this.

Mr. Edwards said he also disagrees with both motions. If they saw another use for the ROW, such as commuter rail, than that would be the only reason to support this. He said this freight corridor isn't something the program needs right now.

Mr. Corman said he doesn't support the motion either. He said it's almost to the program's advantage to strip all the baggage and just know it's going to be preserved by the BNSF. He said they don't have to make the decision now.

Ms. McBride withdrew her motion. She said Kirkland wants the rail line preserved. Freight movement is key within I-405. She said the language doesn't need to say they will purchase it when it's abandoned, it should just say they need to preserve it. She said WSDOT is going to be there and they will have first refusal rights. She said this needs to go on the record.

Chairman Kargianis said WSDOT has been active in preserving these corridors.

Mr. Somers said he agrees with Ms. McBride – they need to preserve the corridor. He withdrew his motion for Option 3.

Mr. Putter made a motion to seek to preserve the BNSF for future transportation purposes. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Corman said he wants to add "if it's abandoned."

Mr. Putter said the language should read "when its abandoned."

Ms. Marshall said she doesn't understand the language of "seek to". Who should seek to? She said they need to clarify that it will be the transportation commission. She said this doesn't have to happen under the program's umbrella.

Mr. Cummings suggested leaving the BNSF element out of the PA and instead send a letter of recommendation to agencies with responsibility stating the interest of the program's Executive Committee to "Actively seek to preserve the property being sold for core area future HCT uses."

Mr. Okamoto said he thinks the letter should be addressed to parties such as Sound Transit, FHWA, etc.

Ms. McBride asked how this would affect the core HCT project? She noted that part of it would potentially be running on some of the land that's being sold off and not in the 50' ROW. She asked if the program needs to deal with this now? Chairman Kargianis said they don't have to deal with this right now.

The committee reached consensus to draft a letter to agencies with responsibility for the BNSF stating the intention of the I-405 Executive Committee to preserve future transportation opportunities in the corridor.

FAILED ELEMENT (by consensus) – Preserve BNSF Right-of-Way for Future Transportation Opportunities

Executive Committee Recommendation: "Do not include preservation of BNSF for future transportation opportunities in the preferred alternative. (Send letter to agencies with responsibility stating interest of I-405 Program Executive Committee in preserving future transportation opportunities in BNSF ROW.)"

Elements of Managed lanes on I-405:

- Manage up to two lanes each direction along I-405 through access restrictions, eligibility.
- Utilize pricing (tolls) as a management tool.

Conditions for Support Managed "Express" Lanes:

- 1. Increase person and vehicle throughput
- 2. Encourage transit and HOV use
- 3. Maintain BRT speed and reliability
- 4. Avoid diversion of traffic to arterials and neighborhood streets
- 5. Provide possible access to long distance freight

Citizen and Steering Recommendations Overview:

- Steering Committee: Strong majority support managing up to 2 lanes and utilizing tolls.
 - Small minority do not support
- Citizen Committee: Evenly divided on concept of managing lanes and utilizing tolls.

Options for Managed Lanes:

- #1. Should we include managed lanes in PA?
 - Yes, subject to conditions and further study*
 - No
- #2. If yes, should pricing (tolls) be part of the strategy?
 - Yes, subject to conditions and further study
 - No

**Would require 4-foot additional width each direction.*

Mr. Mullet moved to support Option #1. The motion was seconded.

Senator Horn said that, again, this is adding complication to the project that doesn't need to be there. He said this would be a new way of operating in Washington and will have lots of attached controversy. He said he is not supportive of managed lanes.

Mr. Putter said he supports the motion. "Managed lanes" does not mean they must be tolled, which is a separate issue. He said that managed lanes means managing the lanes more affectively than now. He said they would also be able to add additional capacity through managed lanes. Managed lanes are not a new concept in the region, they are operating on I-5 in the form of express lanes.

Senator Prentice said she also supports managed lanes. She said if they study it now, she would have the facts before her when she has to answer questions. She said it's just copping out if they don't study it just because it's politically charged.

Mr. Davis said they have to preserve the possibility that in the future people will want to operate the lane. He said that the program has to design the facility right now so it can be managed in the future without having to redesign it. He said it is a design issue.

Mr. Edwards agreed, but doesn't want tolls.

The committee voted to approve Option #1 to modify Alternative #3 to include managed lanes, subject to conditions and further study. The motion passed with 12 votes in support.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by 12 votes) – Manage up to 2 Lanes on I-405

Executive Committee Recommendation: “Manage up to two lanes each direction on I-405. Subject to conditions and further study.”

Option #2: Should pricing (tolls) be part of the strategy?

Mr. Davis asked if the committee has to discuss how the program will pay for it. Mr. Cummings said not in this part of the program.

Mr. Somers motioned for support of tolls as a part of the strategy.

Ms. McBride said she favors Option #2 but wants to take out the word “tolls.” She said she doesn’t want to say “subject to conditions.”

Mr. Edwards said the program doesn’t need Option #2. He said they are going further into funding territory than they need to.

Mr. Putter said this issue is a red flag. He said the program can effectively look at managed lanes without having to call out tolls. He said they don’t need to look exclusively at tolls when they have already been talking about regional pricing.

Mr. Okamoto said that if the motion doesn’t pass, WSDOT would be developing a funding plan including looking tolls anyway.

Ms. Marshall said they shouldn’t call out tolls when there are a number of ideas under the pricing package they already approved.

Mr. Davis said the committee should just take out tolls and keep in pricing if they are going to vote on this.

Mr. Somers agreed and withdrew his motion.

FAILED ELEMENT (by consensus) – Utilize Tolls as a Management Tool

Executive Committee Recommendation: “Do not include tolls as management tool in preferred alternative.” (Tolls should be addressed under the regional pricing element discussed previously.)

Pedestrian and Bike Improvements: Long Trails

- Mostly connections and extensions of existing regional bicycle trails.
- Trail projects already planned by local agencies.

Mr. Cummings noted that this element was taken out of the PPA but is still in Alternative 3.

He said this would take advantage of the BNSF in certain locations.

Citizen and Steering Recommendation Overview:

- Steering Committee: Majority support long trails element.
 - Minority do not support element.
- Citizen Committee: Majority do not support element.
 - Significant minority support element, citing commuting and recreational uses.

Pedestrian and Bike Improvements: Long Trail Options:

- Option #1- Do not include long trails.
 - Trail projects would remain part of local agency plans.
- Option #2- Include long trails.

Ms. McBride asked if this element will be included if the committee doesn't vote. Mr. Cummings said yes.

Mr. Putter moved for Option 1. The motion failed for lack of a second.

APPROVED ELEMENT (by consensus) – Bike and Pedestrian Long Trails

Executive Committee Recommendation: "Include bike and pedestrian long trails."

TDM Pricing Revisited

Mr. Paylor said he would like to bring back the Pricing Option element and handle it same way they did the BNSF. He asked if they could just take it out of the PA and send it in as a recommendation? He said this would take much of the controversy out of it. The motion was seconded.

Ms. McBride said she couldn't support this move because the committee spent a long time getting it in Alternative 3. She said she does not want to revisit the issue.

Mr. Edwards said there is a lack of focus on who the committee will send the letter to. He said they need to make it something that is part of what they have adopted for the corridor. He warned that if it is issued as a letter, they can come up with a long list of recipients but it will still be leaving out some organizations.

Mr. Paylor suggested the committee send the letter to the same people as who will receive the BNSF letter.

The motion did not pass.

Chairman Kargianis said he would be happy to write a letter to the legislature noting the committee isn't trying to affect the funding process with the regional pricing component.

Chairman Kargianis thanked the committee. He said they were able to craft a workable solution.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Ms. Marshall called for a vote to pass her original motion in support of Alternative 3 as the program's preferred alternative, subject to approved amendments and modifications.

The motion was passed by acclamation.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kargianis at 5:45 p.m.